

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached Replacement Sheet 27 of the drawings includes changes to FIG. 13. This sheet, which includes only FIG. 13, replaces the original Sheet 27 including only FIG. 13. In replacement FIG. 13, box 1330 has been amended to include the missing closing parenthesis. Box 1330 now reads --PROVIDE ADVERTISEMENT WITHIN INTERACTIVE APPLICATION) (E.G., INTERACTIVE PROGRAM GUIDE, OPERATING SYSTEM, WEB BROWSER, HOME SHOPPING APPLICATION, ETC.)--.

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 85-136 were pending in this application.

The Office Action objected to FIG. 13 for minor informalities.

The Office Action objected to the specification for minor informalities.

Claims 85-94, 98-107, 111-120, and 124-133 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 (hereinafter "Alexander").

Claims 95-97, 108-110, 121-123, and 134-136 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Knee et al U.S. Patent No. 5,589,892 (hereinafter "Knee").

II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended independent claims 85, 98, 111, and 124 to more particularly define the invention. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed and do not add new matter. See, e.g., page 36, line 24 - page 37, line 8.

III. Applicants' Reply to the Drawing Objection

The Office Action objected to FIG. 13 for containing a typographical error. In response, applicants submit herewith one (1) Replacement Sheet 27, containing amended FIG. 13, to be

substituted for the original Sheet 27 filed with this application on July 11, 2003. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to FIG. 13 be withdrawn.

IV. Applicants' Reply to the Specification Objections

The Office Action objected to applicants' specification by contending that "[t]he title of the invention is not descriptive" and a "new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed" (Office Action, page 4). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants' title recites, "Systems and methods for coordinating interactive and passive advertisement and merchandising opportunities." Applicants' independent claims 85, 98, 111, and 124 recite displaying a "full-screen television commercial associated with a given advertiser" and additionally displaying "interactive television program guide information and a graphic advertisement." As such, applicants' claims are generally directed to passive and interactive advertisements. Furthermore, applicants' claims discuss various merchandising opportunities in, for example, claims 95-97, 108-110, 121-123, and 134-136. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the title is descriptive of the claimed invention and request that the objection to the specification's title be withdrawn.

The Office Action also objected to applicants' specification for the use of trademarks, and requested applicants to "capitalize each letter of a trademark or

accompany the trademark with an appropriate designation symbol" and to "use each trademark as an adjective modifying a descriptive noun" (Office Action, page 4). In response, applicants have amended the specification on pages 2-8 of this Reply to appropriately identify trademarks. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that this objection to the specification be withdrawn.

V. The 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 85-94, 98-107, 111-120, and 124-133 as being anticipated by Alexander. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, applicants' independent claims 85, 98, 111, and 124 are directed to a method, systems, and computer readable medium for presenting a user with a graphic advertisement in an interactive television program guide (IPG). Without entering the interactive television program guide, a full-screen television commercial that is associated with a given advertiser is displayed. An icon that indicates the availability of IPG information is overlaid on the full-screen television commercial to provide a user with an opportunity to access the IPG information. When the user accesses the IPG information in response to the icon, the interactive television program guide is displayed with the IPG information and a graphic advertisement associated with the given advertiser.

Alexander refers to an electronic program guide (EPG) that offers improvements over previous electronic program guides. See Alexander, column 2, lines 1-2. One embodiment of

Alexander includes an EPG with windows that can display "an ad for a product or service" and "an ad for a future telecast program." See Alexander, FIG. 1, windows 14 and 16, column 4, lines 28-29, and column 4, lines 34-35. While in the EPG, a user can highlight the ad, "resulting in the automatic display of an expanded information box." See Alexander, column 21, lines 15-17 and FIG. 10a and FIG. 10b. An "i" icon can be placed on an ad in the EPG to indicate there is more information available for that ad. See Alexander, column 26, lines 14-16.

Contrary to the Examiner's contention, Alexander fails to show all features of applicants' claimed invention. In particular, Alexander fails to show "displaying, without entering the interactive television program guide, a full-screen television commercial" and "overlaying an icon on the full-screen television commercial, wherein the icon indicates the availability of the interactive program guide information," as required by applicants' amended independent claims 85, 98, 111, and 124. Although Alexander generally refers to displaying an "i" icon to show more information is available, Alexander always requires a user to first enter an electronic program guide prior to providing this feature. See, e.g., Alexander, column 26, lines 8-16. Furthermore, although Alexander does recite that an ad window, such as windows 14 and 16 of FIG. 1, can be a full-screen ad, the viewer is still required to first enter the electronic program guide prior to this ad being displayed. See, e.g., Alexander, column 24, lines 22-24.

In contrast, applicants' claimed approach advantageously provides a user with an indication of the availability of interactive television program guide information without first requiring the user to enter an interactive program guide. For example, applicants' specification states that "[c]onventional television programming or passive video product promotions may be combined with interactive impulse-purchase features . . . when interactive content is available for a product or service, an alert icon may be overlaid onto a video signal." See applicants' specification, page 7, lines 10-22. As such, applicants' claimed invention allows conventional television commercials displayed outside the interactive guide to be associated with interactive information. An icon may then be overlaid onto this conventional programming. Nowhere does Alexander show or suggest this feature of applicants' invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants submit that Alexander fails to show or suggest all of the claimed features recited in independent claims 85, 98, 111, and 124. Alexander also fails to show or suggest all the claimed features recited in applicants' dependent claims 86-97, 99-110, 112-123, and 125-136, each of which contains all the limitations of its respective independent claim. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 85-94, 98-107, 111-120, and 124-133 be withdrawn.


VI. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The Office Action rejected dependent claims 95-97, 108-110, 121-123, and 134-136 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander in view of Knee. Applicants submit that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent base claims, claims 85, 98, 111, and 124. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection of claims 95-97, 108-110, 121-123, and 134-136 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

VII. Conclusion

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 85-136 are allowable. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian E. Mack
Reg. No. 57,189
Agent for Applicants
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 75563
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8704
Tel.: (212) 596-9000